

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

CHRISTOPHER N. HERNANDEZ,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	No. 3:21-cv-00584
v.)	
)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
KEVIN GENOVESE,)	
)	
Respondent.)	


ORDER

Before the Court is Christopher N. Hernandez’s Petition for habeas corpus relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. (Doc. No. 1.) After careful analysis, the Court concludes that Hernandez is not entitled to relief under Section 2254 on any of his claims, for the reasons set forth in the accompanying Memorandum Opinion. Accordingly, the Petition is **DENIED**, and this action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

The Court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability (“COA”), Habeas Rule 11(a), depending on whether a petitioner “has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). “A petitioner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that jurists of reason could disagree with the district court’s resolution of his constitutional claims or that jurists could conclude the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 327 (2003). “[A] COA does not require a showing that the appeal will succeed,” but courts should not issue a COA as a matter of course. *Id.* at 336. The Court concludes that Petitioner has not satisfied this standard and **DENIES** a COA. Petitioner may seek a COA directly from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. Habeas Rule 11; Fed. R. App. P. 22(b)(1).

This is the final order denying all relief in this case. The Clerk **SHALL** enter judgment.
Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.


ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE